

AUG 30 2006

Serial No.: 09/976,637
Attorney Docket No.: 10018637-1**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated May 31, 2006, claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8-9 have been amended. Claims 1-11 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite.

In response, the Applicants have amended appropriate claims to overcome the rejection as suggested by the Examiner.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Krsul et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,839,119).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

Specifically, among other things, the Applicants' claims 1, 2, 4 and 9 now include generating at least one recommendation for a given entity associated with the secret shares based on the entity's past activities and an intersection of sets of activities associated with the entity's secret shares as an estimated activities list, wherein activities found in each set of activities associated with each secret share of the given entity's secret shares are included in the estimated activities list, wherein activities found in less than all of the sets of activities associated with the entity's secret shares are excluded, wherein association of the activities with the plurality of secret shares facilitates anonymous transactions and anonymous recommendations and controlling recommendation accuracy by modifying usage, number of activities and a size of a number of possible secret share sets for any given entity identity.

Also, independent claims 3 and 8 now include generating a set of recommendations based on the estimated activities list and providing the set of recommendations to the first entity and controlling recommendation accuracy by modifying usage, number of activities and a size of a number of possible secret share sets for any given entity identity. Support for these newly claimed elements of claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8-9 can be found throughout the specification. For example, support for the claims in the original specification (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046198) can be found in FIG. 3., the Summary of the Invention and at least in paragraphs [0025], [0041] and [0046].

Serial No.: 09/976,637
Attorney Docket No.: 10018637-1

In contrast, Krsul et al. merely disclose a "...method of generating electronic monetary tokens that supports off-line transactions while preventing double-spending." Although "...the provider splits each electronic monetary token into two electronic token halves and associates with each the same serial number..." and the "...electronic token halves when combined recreate the electronic monetary token from which they were generated (see Abstract, FIGS. 4A and 4B and col. 2, lines 19-48 of Krsul et al.), Krsul et al. is still missing features of the Applicant's claimed invention.

Specifically, Krsul et al. is clearly missing, among other things, the Applicants' generating at least one recommendation based on the entity's past activities and an intersection of sets of activities associated with the entity's secret shares as an estimated activities list, wherein activities found in each set of activities associated with each secret share of the given entity's secret shares are included in the estimated activities list, wherein activities found in less than all of the sets of activities associated with the entity's secret shares are excluded, wherein association of the activities with the plurality of secret shares facilitates anonymous transactions and anonymous recommendations and controlling recommendation accuracy by modifying usage, number of activities and a size of a number of possible secret share sets for any given entity identity of claims 1, 2, 4 and 9.

Further, Krsul et al. is missing the Applicants' claimed generating a set of recommendations based on the estimated activities list and providing the set of recommendations to the first entity and controlling recommendation accuracy by modifying usage, number of activities and a size of a number of possible secret share sets for any given entity identity of claims 3 and 8. As such, since Krsul et al. do not disclose the above argued features of the Applicants' claimed invention, Krsul et al. cannot anticipate the claims.

With regard to the rejections of the dependent claims, because these rejected claims depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these rejected dependent claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejected claims are in immediate condition for allowance.

AUG 30 2006

Serial No.: 09/976,637
Attorney Docket No.: 10018637-1

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding claim rejections and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to expedite and further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly invite the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at (818) 885-1575. Please note that all correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: August 30, 2006



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants